

# **Philanthropic Investments in the Emerging Field of *Women, Peace and Security***



Katherine Magraw  
Director, *Peace and Security Funders Group*  
March, 2012

## Table of Contents

<b>I.</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II.</b>	<b>THE NEED FOR FUNDING.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>THE CASE FOR EMPOWERING AND PROTECTING WOMEN IN ARMED CONFLICT.....</b>	<b>2</b>
	<i>ENHANCING WOMEN'S CONTRIBUTION TO PEACE BUILDING.....</i>	<i>2</i>
	<i>PREVENTING VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN DURING AND AFTER CONFLICT.....</i>	<i>3</i>
	<i>BUILDING A CULTURE OF PEACE .....</i>	<i>3</i>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL FUNDERS.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>V.</b>	<b>STATE OF THE PHILANTHROPIC EFFORT .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>VI.</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF 2010 GRANTMAKING .....</b>	<b>5</b>
	<i>TABLE 1: FUNDING BY GRANTMAKER.....</i>	<i>7</i>
	<i>TABLE 2: FUNDING BY PRIMARY STRATEGY .....</i>	<i>8</i>
	<i>TABLE 3: FUNDING BY REGIONS SERVED.....</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>TABLE 4: 10 LARGEST GRANTS IN 2010.....</i>	<i>10</i>
<b>VII.</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY.....</b>	<b>11</b>
	<i>SCOPE OF THE DATABASE.....</i>	<i>11</i>
	<i>CLASSIFICATION.....</i>	<i>11</i>
	<i>TIMEFRAME.....</i>	<i>12</i>
	<i>REGRANTING .....</i>	<i>12</i>
<b>VIII.</b>	<b>MASTER LIST OF GRANTMAKING ENTITIES .....</b>	<b>13</b>

### Contact information:

Katherine Magraw  
Director, Peace and Security Funder's Group  
kmagraw@peaceandsecurity.org  
434-989-1514

# **Philanthropic Investments in the Emerging Field of Women, Peace and Security**

## **I. Introduction**

Over a decade after the passage of the historic UN Security Council Resolution 1325, an international community of activists, policymakers and funders dedicated to the resolution's implementation has emerged. The resolution mandates the consideration of gender issues in all international interventions to build peace and resolve conflicts. In doing so, it highlights the centrality of engaging and protecting women as critical agents of peace. The development and visibility of this new movement of activism is itself a significant achievement of the Security Council resolution.

Across the globe, the burgeoning local, national and international initiatives focused on conflict prevention, resolution, and rebuilding, increasingly recognize the critical need to include and empower women. The funding community also has begun to respond to the heightened awareness of and new opportunities to invest in this area. Among U.S. foundations and philanthropists, which more often than not shy away from work on war and peace, this appears to be a growth area, characterized by a sense of energy and commitment, especially among relatively new funders.

Two recent positive developments underscore the growing recognition of the importance of these efforts. On the global stage, three women from Liberia and Yemen -- Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Leymah Gbowee and Tawakkul Karman -- were awarded the Nobel Peace Prize last October in recognition of their struggle for women's rights and contribution to peacebuilding. And in the United States, President Obama in December, 2011, released the first-ever *U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security*, and signed an Executive Order ordering the Plan's implementation. The two documents chart a roadmap for how the United States will accelerate and institutionalize efforts across the government to advance women's participation in preventing conflict and keeping peace. These recent developments build on the momentum generated by a host of actions undertaken in concert with the 10<sup>th</sup> anniversary of UNSCR 1325 in October, 2010, and the establishment of UN Women.

However, despite the new salience of this agenda, the consensual assessment is that we have seen little change on the ground. According to two critical measurements of progress -- women's participation in peace processes and incidence of violence against women in conflicts -- the results are meager. The use of rape in war is undiminished, with impunity for the perpetrators, despite the establishment of new norms and legal instruments. Ongoing research done by the UN Development Fund for Women finds that only one in thirteen participants in peace negotiations since 1992 has been a woman. The result is agreements that often don't reflect ground truth and are as likely to fail as to succeed. Moreover, the emphasis on getting women to the "table" often leads to the mistaken assumption that access is the same as influence. In a similar vein, the shining examples of individual women who have gained leadership positions are, more often than not, isolated cases of individual achievement rather than indicators that a critical mass of woman has assumed leadership positions in key sectors.

## **II. The Need for Funding**

The urgent challenge to empower and protect women in conflict areas is made all the more challenging because this is still a nascent field of endeavor, struggling to develop an agreed agenda and knowledge base, and attract the necessary societal, political and financial resources. Funding, as always, is critically important. Not surprisingly, as this is a new field for funders also, the pool of institutional donors is small and the total resources available amount to a tiny fraction of funds invested internationally. Private funders with a focus on women have been engaged for many years in supporting initiatives related to access to healthcare and education, gender equality, prevention of violence and economic development. Funders working in the peace and security field are increasingly investing in initiatives to prevent and resolve civil conflict and build a culture of peace. But work at the intersection of these two areas is just starting to attract support. The good news, as described below, is that this is increasing with each year.

This field is typically understood to encompass three, inter-related, broad objectives, which are summarized below. This is followed by a brief discussion of funding from multilateral and bilateral sources. The bulk of this article is devoted to an analysis conducted by the Peace and Security Funders Group of private grantmaking, based on extensive data on grantgiving in 2010 that provides a snapshot view of how much funding is available, and to whom and for what purposes it is directed.\* The bottom line, not surprisingly, is that vastly more resources are needed, including from private sources. It is hoped that the information presented here will encourage more funders to enter the field and greater investments by those already working in the field.

## **III. The Case for Empowering and Protecting Women in Armed Conflict**

### Enhancing women's contribution to peacebuilding

Women are relegated to the sidelines in peace negotiations and conflict resolution processes as the overwhelmingly male combatants struggle to transition from war-making to peace-making. Increasing and enhancing the participation of women is not just an issue of gender equality and human rights; it is critical to building a sustainable peace. Some studies show that more than half of all peace agreements fail within 10 years, and those that endure are typically marred by continuing high levels of violence. Evidence from across the globe shows that when women play a significant role in peace negotiations, backed up by inclusion in the full range of decision-making institutions in their country, they ensure that critical societal priorities and needs are incorporated into the settlements, increasing the chances of a just and lasting peace. This is common sense as women are often the focal point for nongovernmental organizations and community initiatives, and are typically more interested in reconciliation and compromise. Partly because so many men are often war casualties, women also take the lead in rebuilding and implementing agreements at the community level.

\* The author is greatly indebted to Carah Ong who collected, entered and analyzed the grant data for the Peace and Security Funders Group.



### Preventing violence against women during and after conflict

Violence against woman and girls, particularly forms of sexual violence, is recognized as a common feature of civil conflicts. Such violence is often deployed systematically as a weapon of war; in other circumstances it is tolerated and opportunistic. Either way, it is too often met with impunity for the perpetrators, silence from the society, and is both a cause and a consequence of further societal breakdown. Violence against women often continues, and sometimes even increases in the post-conflict environment. Freedom from the threat of violence is a prerequisite for the agency of women. No society can restore peace or stability if its female population fears daily assault or rape; and no government can hope to gain legitimacy if there is no accountability for such acts.

### Building a culture of peace

Focusing solely on increasing the number of women participating in policy making is insufficient since it does not address the social-cultural norms that inform those processes, or the cultures of violence and patriarchal political systems that reproduce existing gender power inequalities. Thus, efforts to support women's participation in all levels of decision making must also address deeper societal drivers of inequality and violence. The same is true of efforts to prevent conflict before it begins – the status and prosperity of woman can be key indicators of coming violence and are related to the likelihood of violence.

As long as security continues to be defined primarily in military terms and exclusively connected to the notion of the state, it will be difficult to chart a path towards a sustainable peace. And the difficulty is compounded by the fact that the military in many countries, including the U.S. military, continues to claim a huge fraction of a state's federal budget and exert outsize influence on the political, cultural and economic life of the society. Efforts to promote the alternative notion of "human security" transcend work focused on women and armed conflict, yet are an integral part of it.

## **IV. Bilateral and Multilateral Funders**

Bilateral funding (government grants to NGOs and/or initiatives in countries other than their own) and multilateral funding (support provided to NGOs and initiatives through international entities) greatly surpasses funding from foundations and philanthropists. Most of the bilateral aid is provided as international development cooperation and aid to conflict-affected countries. Multilateral aid comes primarily from UN entities such as the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the United Nations Population Fund, the United Nations Children's Fund and the recently established United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and the Empowerment of Women (UN Women). Peace and security is one of five priorities of UN Women.

Tracking and analyzing bilateral and multilateral investments in this area is challenging due to the widely varying and inconsistent ways and means of reporting the data and difficulty of obtaining it. A good start has been made by Organisation for Economic

Co-operation and Development (OECD), Cordaid, and the Association of Women's Rights in Development, who have published informative studies on bilateral and multilateral aid. However, the evidence is clear that the resources committed to this work are steadily and markedly increasing. For example, OECD found that bilateral aid from the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) countries that was classified as assistance in the "peace and security sector" and focused on "gender equality and participatory development" has increased dramatically over the past decade. OECD calculated that the total assistance flowing from the DAC countries in 2009 in this area was \$683.9 million. This amount represents nearly six times the amount (\$119.1 million) provided just three years earlier in 2006. Although it is unclear whether all these funds were intended to empower women as agents of peace in conflicts, the data points to an upsurge in funding in this area.

National plans to implement UNSCR 1325 presumably will help increase attention and resources given to the women, peace and security agenda. The U.S. released its plan last December, as noted above, joining 34 other countries including, most notably, Belgium, France, Norway, Sweden and the United Kingdom. The Norwegian plan, for example, specifically calls for financial support to ensure women's participation and representation in peace processes and Sweden's commits resources to helping end sexual and other gender based violence in conflict-affected countries.

Funding from private and public foundations serves a different function from multilateral and bilateral funding. Whereas the latter reflects official policy of Member States of individual states governments, funding by foundations is far less constrained and thus enjoys an independence and flexibility that governmental entities do not have. Private foundations also are able to act quickly, to knowingly take risks, and to innovate. Moreover, foundation support is needed to address the serious shortage of empirical data and to facilitate the incorporation of work on gender and conflict into the international security studies field.

## **V. State of the Philanthropic Effort**

Civil society organizations, with encouragement from multilateral institutions, are devoting increased time and resources to addressing the contribution of women in peacebuilding and the gender aspects of armed conflict. Foundation and philanthropists in the U.S. and Europe are starting to respond to the needs and opportunities this creates. However, not surprisingly given the newness of this field for philanthropists, this collective effort is marked by a number of weaknesses.

There is not agreement among foundations on a definition of the field. What are the objectives of this work and which are most important? What thematic areas of work are included in this field? Where is the overlap between related fields, such as work to advance women's rights, health, and economic development, and the women, peace and security agenda? Although it is not necessary to have a consensual view, it would be helpful to the development of this field to have generally accepted understandings of these issues. The under-developed state of conceptualization of the field hampers

practitioners, multilateral donors and private donors alike. A second major issue is that the field suffers from a lack of empirical research on gender issues in conflict. Research and analysis is needed to document the importance of these issues and assess the effectiveness of various measures to address the problems. The fact that few foundations have dedicated programs in this area will slow progress in addressing these deficiencies.

## **VI. Analysis of 2010 Grantmaking**

In order to shed light on the state of private philanthropy in the field of women, peace and security, the Peace and Security Funders Group (PSFG) undertook research to present a snapshot of funding in 2010. In particular, we aimed to gain an understanding of the scale of the funding available, as well as the priorities and programs of funders. For purposes of this study, we use the term: the Women, Peace and Security (WPS) agenda.

PSFG identified and collected data on relevant grantgiving from 39 entities, of which 36 are private foundations, two are anonymous individuals donors with a focus in this field and one is affiliated with a government (the Canadian International Development Research Centre.) Seven of the 36 foundations are based outside of the United States. In all but two instances (the Asia Foundation and the Guggenheim Foundation), we obtained data on individual grants authorized in 2010. The resulting database of 390 grants allowed us to calculate total investments and track the flow of these resources to different issues, grantees, geographic areas, and so on. All grant awards were converted to US dollars at the current exchange rate.

Despite PSFG's efforts to be comprehensive, many foundations, particularly international ones, are undoubtedly missing from this study. Additionally, given normal yearly fluctuations in foundations expenditures due to multi-year budgeting and changing priorities, such a snapshot view of a given moment in time may contain distortions. Moreover, for the purposes of this study we developed a definition of the field that determined what grants are included and what aren't, and a system of classification that we applied consistently in categorizing grants. We took great care to be as clear and intellectually rigorous as possible; however our approach may not be consistent with that of any one foundation. Grantmakers regard their work in diverse ways, using differing criteria and definitions that are internally coherent and that advance individual missions. Our system of classification reflects no judgment about the value of grants or any one foundation's approach to its grantmaking. It was designed to present a nuanced, valid picture of the field, without becoming so elaborate and/or broad as to lose the capacity to draw meaningful conclusions about giving. A list of the foundations included in this research, a working definition of the Peace and Security Agenda, and a brief discussion of the methodology follows the findings.

➤ **Foundation funding for work to promote the Women, Peace and Security agenda in 2010 totaled more than \$36 million dollars.**

Thirty-eight grantmaking entities made commitments in 2010 to invest \$33,176,335 in civil society efforts to further the WPS agenda, in addition to an estimated \$3 million in grants from the Asia Foundation.

Funding in this area lags far behind philanthropic investments in other international areas such as global health, development, and response to humanitarian crises. But that can be said as well of funding in the broader field of prevention and resolution of conflict. The database of grants, representing just one year and a far from exhaustive search, demonstrates that there is significant interest from the philanthropic community. Moreover, discussions with these foundations and several others which were not awarding grants in this area in 2010 but may in the future (such as the Rockefeller Foundation, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund, and the Compton Foundation, among others) suggest considerable potential for growth.

➤ **Several additional millions of dollars were awarded to re-granting foundations that support Women, Peace and Security.**

We identified a total of \$2,855,011 from among the foundations we surveyed that was provided to others for re-granting. The principal recipients were Global Fund for Women, Urgent Action Fund, and Mama Cash, all foundations with mature programs in this field and sterling reputations. However, not all these monies are used for WPS grants since these regranting foundations have broader agendas and some of it likely supported overhead and other costs.

Providing funds to these regranting organizations is a wise strategy given that the field is still young and that few foundations have a dedicated program in this area. This approach was used by several large foundations in the database. For example, the Ford Foundation, awarded grants to both Mama Cash (\$200,000) and Urgent Action Fund (\$350,000). Oak Foundation provided three grants amounting to \$1,431,621 to re-granting entities (\$750,000 to Global Fund for Women, \$626,621 to Mama Cash, and \$55,000 to Urgent Action Fund. It is worth noting that the London-based Sigrid Rausing Trust in 2009 (and thus not counted in this study of 2010 funding) made a three-year grant to Mama Cash for 1,650,000 euros (approximately \$2 million.)

The regranting totals are far greater than what is documented here as we did not capture all grants to the three foundations cited above, and there are other re-granting organizations such as the Swedish-based Kvinna till Kvinna, and other women's funds that did not figure in the database.

In order to avoid double-counting dollars, the regranting monies are allocated *solely* to the foundations doing the regranting, and not the original source of the dollars. Thus the regranting funds are not included in the \$36 million total cited above. (See methodology section for further explanation.

➤ **Eight foundations awarded over \$1 million in grants in 2010.**

Cordaid, NoVo Foundation, Open Society Foundation, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Humanity United, Swanee Hunt Family Foundation, Avon Foundation, and the Sigrid Rausing Trust all made over \$1 million in grants. If grants to re-granting foundations are included in the total, then three additional foundations top \$1 million in 2010 grantgiving: Oak Foundation, the Global Fund for Women, and the Ford Foundation.

Some of this group gave few, very large grants. For example, the Gates Foundation gave just one grant to the IRC, earmarked for protection of women. And the Avon Foundation gave two grants, also related to violence against women, to Vital Voices and the Secretary of State's Women's Leadership Fund. The Swanee Hunt Family Foundation provided a single grant to the Institute for Inclusive Security, a program of the Hunt Alternatives Fund.

Asia Foundation grants in this area likely top \$1 million also, but we were not able to obtain a list of individual grants and thus did not have a definitive dollar total. The Foundation works on both women's empowerment in conflict zones and on conflict, in which it seeks to mainstream gender where possible. In 2010, it provided almost \$7 million in grants from its "Women Empowerment" thematic area and another \$5 million from its "Conflict and Fragile Conditions" thematic area.

**Table 1. Funding by Grantmaker, with total grant dollars over \$500,000**

<b>Foundation</b>	<b>2010 Amount</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b># of Grants</b>
Cordaid	\$6,816,500	20.6%	33
Novo Foundation	\$5,925,000	17.9%	12
Open Society Foundations International Women's Program	\$5,368,529	16.2%	75
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation	\$2,479,514	7.5%	1
Humanity United	\$1,516,222	4.6%	9
Swanee Hunt Family Foundation	\$1,335,000	4%	1
Avon Foundation	\$1,250,000	3.8%	2
Sigrid Rausing Trust	\$1,165,498	3.5%	3
Global Fund for Women	\$972,100	2.9%	72
Oak Foundation	\$886,154	2.7%	4
HIVOS	\$797,000	2.4%	6
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation	\$600,000	1.8%	1
Ford Foundation	\$600,000	1.8%	3
United States Institute of Peace	\$567,939	1.7%	5



➤ **The three largest foundations (by total grant amount) accounted for over half of the grant monies.**

The Netherlands-based Cordaid (with over \$6.8 million in grants), NoVo Foundation (over \$5.9 million) and the Open Society Foundations International Women’s Program (over \$5.3 million) provided 55 percent of grant funds. (These totals do not include their grants given to re-granting foundations.)

As a group, their average size grant was \$153,000, as compared to the average size of all grants in the database of \$80,266. The medium size of all grants – that is, one half of the grants were larger, one half were smaller – was \$20,000.

➤ **Funding was provided for a variety of strategies, but efforts to support mobilization, training and education of women attracted nearly half of all funds.**

The priority given to work to mobilize, train and educate women is consistent with the focus on empowering women as leaders in peacebuilding and post-conflict processes.

The second highest ranking strategy was for working in the field with parties directly involved in conflict, including mediation and providing direct relief or resources and legal aid, which garnered more than a third of all funds. The following five strategies (in descending order of “priority”) – Policy Advocacy, Research and Analysis, Youth Development, Media & Communications -- shared among them just 19 percent of funding.

**Table 2. Funding by Primary Strategy**

Strategy	2010 Funding	% of total	Number of Grants
Mobilization, Training and Education	\$16,150,214	48.7	186
Work in the field	\$10,864,274	32.7	153
Advocacy	\$3,196,302	9.6	20
Research and Analysis	\$2,537,202	7.8	21
Youth Development	\$293,343	0.97	8
Lobbying	\$79,000	0.2	2
Media & Communications	\$20,000	0.1	1
<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$33,176,335 *</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>391</b>

\* Funding from the Guggenheim Foundation is included here, as one “research” grant. Grants from the Asia Society and Swanee Hunt Family Foundation are not included in this breakdown.

➤ **Efforts to empower women as leaders in decision-making or address sexual violence in conflict are the dominant concerns of funders, as measured by dollars**

Funding in these two areas: women's empowerment and sexual violence accounted for 60 percent of the grant dollars.

139 of the 390 grants (35.6%) amounting to \$12,770,244 (or 38.5% of total funds) were made to support efforts to empower women as leaders; increase the participation and representation of women at all levels of decision-making in countries of conflict or post-conflict reconciliation; or implement UN Security Council Resolution 1325.

72 of the grants (18.5%) amounting to \$7,626,247 (or 23% of total funds) were made to prevent or end sexual violence in countries of conflict, or to rehabilitate victims of rape and sexual violence in countries of conflict.

➤ **Grants were directed globally, but the greatest share of the funding was given to grantees with a focus on Africa.**

Grantees focused on Africa received well over one-third of all grant dollars. Grantees with a focus on multiple regions received over a quarter of all funding. The following regions – the Middle East, South Asia, Central America, South America, Eastern Europe, Southeast Asia, Eurasia, North America and Asia – shared among them 36 percent of funding.

**Table 3. Funding by Region Served**

<b>Regional Focus</b>	<b>2010 Funding</b>	<b>% of Total</b>	<b>Number of Grants</b>
Africa	\$12,754,059	38.5%	122
Global	\$9,332,900	28%	49
South Asia	\$3,639,402	11%	61
Central America	\$2,288,925	6.9%	19
South America	\$2,144,666	6.5%	20
Middle East	\$1,613,150	4.9%	41
Eastern Europe	\$439,478	1.3%	8
Southeast Asia	\$348,150	1.1%	25
Eurasia	\$279,105	0.8%	29
North America	\$269,500	0.8%	13
Asia	\$31,000	0.1%	3
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>\$33,140,335</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>390</b>

➤ **Far more grants were awarded to international grantees than U.S.-based grantees**

Of the 390 grants, 80 percent of them were made to grantees based across the globe. However, these grants only accounted for 53 percent of the grant dollars. The average size of grants made to U.S.-based grantees was \$199,481; whereas the average size of grants made to international grantees was \$56,348. This is not surprising given that many grants to local or regional initiatives were comparatively small. This suggests there is clearly a role for smaller funders and smaller grants. Documentation on the value of small interventions would strengthen the case for small funders.

➤ **The ten largest grants amounted to just under \$11.6 million or over a third of all funding.**

**Table 4. The ten largest grants in 2010**

- **Novo Foundation to International Rescue Committee** for support for Women and Girls Rebuilding Nations, an IRC initiative empowering women and girls in Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Cote D'Ivoire to equally contribute to and access the benefits of reconstruction and peace and live free from sexual and physical violence (\$3,000,000)
- **Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation to the International Rescue Committee** to provide multidisciplinary emergency responders with training and technical support for the practical application of models that improve the safety and security of women and children (\$2,479,514)
- **Swanee Hunt Family Foundation to the Institute for Inclusive Security** for the participation of women in peace processes (\$1,335,000)
- **Novo Foundation to V-Day** for work to end sexual violence, including the City of Joy in the Democratic Republic of Congo (\$1,000,000)
- **Avon Foundation to Vital Voices** to expand the Global Partnership to End Violence Against Women (\$750,000)
- **Sigrid Rausing Trust to the Women's Initiatives for Gender Justice** for core support (\$723,426)
- **Cordaid to Afghan Women for Afghan Women** for centers in Kabul and Mazar-e-sharif (\$648,000)
- **John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to American Bar Association Rule of Law Initiative** to improve access to justice for victims of sexual and gender-based violence in the eastern Democratic Republic of Congo (\$600,000)
- **Cordaid to Integrated Rural Development Service Organization** for women in governance in Manipur (\$555,000)
- **Cordaid to Afghan Women Resource Center** for women's sustainable economic empowerment (\$505,000)

## **VII. Methodology**

### **Scope of the Database**

Individual grants were collected from each foundation's online grants database, 2010 annual report, 2010 IRS 990 form or from foundation staff. Only grants that were specifically related to women, peace and security were included in the database and coded. This report defines "women, peace and security" as grants made with the stated intent of supporting women or women's organizations to provide support for:

- increased participation and representation of women at all levels of decision-making in countries of conflict or post-conflict transitions;
- protecting the needs of women and girls in conflict and protecting and assisting victims of gender-targeted violence in conflict;
- supporting a gender perspective in conflict prevention, resolution and post-conflict processes;
- implementing UN Security Council Resolution 1325;
- building a culture of peace and international security.

Countries considered to be at conflict were based on Foreign Policy's list of country's in conflict or at war in 2010: Afghanistan, Burma, Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Gaza, Georgia, Guatemala, India (some regions), Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Israel, Mexico, Nigeria, Nepal, North Korea, Pakistan, Peru (some regions), Philippines, Somalia, Sudan, South Sudan, Thailand, Uganda, Uzbekistan, and Yemen.

In order to promote clarity of this study's findings, PSFG excluded grants whose primary purpose was not related to the WPS agenda. For example, grants made to women's organizations for work on sex trafficking, domestic violence (not related to a conflict), ending discrimination against women (except when embedded in conflict situations), reproductive health, HIV/AIDS, LGBT issues, or the promotion of general women's rights internationally were not included.

### **Classification**

Grants were coded for their geographical focus and for the primary strategy to be adopted by the grantee. Strategies included:

- Policy advocacy
- Grassroots and grassroots organizing, and key constituency mobilization and public education, including trainings, conferences and empowerment
- Media, Communications and Messaging
- Policy analysis and research, and development of policy recommendations.
- Youth leadership development and training
- Working in the field with parties directly involved in conflict, including mediation and providing direct relief or resources and legal aid

**Timeframe**

Only grants authorized in 2010 are included in the database. In order to reflect the priorities of the funders, the total amount of multi-year grants that were authorized in 2010 are included in the data.

**Regranting**

To avoid double-counting dollars, this analysis allocates regranting monies solely to the foundations responsible for regranting, rather than the original source of funding. This method provides the most information about where and for what purposes the monies are going, thus capturing the intent of the primary funder and the regranting institution.



## VIII. Master List of Grantmaking Entities Included in Study

African Women's Development Fund (Accra, Ghana)  
American Jewish World Service Women's Empowerment Fund (New York, NY)  
Avon Foundation (New York, NY)  
Asia Foundation (San Francisco, CA)<sup>i</sup>  
Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (Seattle, WA)  
Channel Foundation (Seattle, WA)  
Connect U.S. Fund (Washington, DC)  
Cordaid (The Hague, The Netherlands)  
Ford Foundation (New York, NY)  
Fred J. Hansen Foundation (San Diego, CA)  
Fund for Global Human Rights (Washington, DC)  
Flora Family Foundation (Menlo Park, CA)  
Global Fund for Children (Washington, DC)  
Global Fund for Women (San Francisco, CA)  
Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, (New York, NY)<sup>ii</sup>  
HIVOS (The Hague, The Netherlands)  
Humanity United (Redwood City, CA)  
Hunt Alternatives Fund/Institute for Inclusive Security (Washington, DC)  
International Development Research Centre (Ottawa, Canada)  
Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust (York, U.K.)  
John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation (Chicago, IL)  
Mama Cash (Amsterdam, The Netherlands)  
Mellon Foundation (New York, NY)  
Moriah Fund (Washington, DC)  
Nike Foundation (Beaverton, OR)<sup>iii</sup>  
NoVo Foundation (New York, NY)<sup>iv</sup>  
Oak Foundation (Geneva, Switzerland)  
Open Society Foundations International Women's Program (New York, NY)  
David and Lucile Packard Foundation (Los Altos, CA)  
Ploughshares Fund (San Francisco, CA)  
Private Anonymous Donor  
Private Anonymous Donor  
Rockefeller Foundation (New York, NY)  
Arthur B. Schultz Foundation (Ketchum, ID)  
Sigrid Rausing Trust (London, U.K.)  
Swanee Hunt Family Foundation (Cambridge, MA)<sup>v</sup>  
United States Institute of Peace (Washington, DC)  
Urgent Action Fund (Boulder, CO)<sup>vi</sup>  
Women's Fund in Georgia (Tbilisi, Georgia)

---

<sup>i</sup> No information on individual grants was available; an estimate of total grantgiving dollars was included in the overall total for the field.

<sup>ii</sup> A total of \$36,000 awarded in research grants in this area. These are not further coded.

<sup>iii</sup> Only partial 2010 information available.

<sup>iv</sup> Some NoVo Foundation grants are for work beyond the WPS agenda. Staff provided estimates of the amount of each grant that pertained to conflict areas and the theme of gender, peace, and security.

<sup>v</sup> One large grant was made to the Institute for Inclusive Society, a program of the Hunt Alternatives Fund. This was counted in the 2010 total, but not further coded.

<sup>vi</sup> Urgent Action Fund made an additional 52 confidential grants in 2010 for which the grant sum is unknown.